

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
SR-520/TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
NORTH BELLEVUE SENIOR CENTER, BELLEVUE
JUNE 4, 2002 — 9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.**

The Technical Committee of the Trans-Lake Washington Project met on June 4, 2002 at the North Bellevue Senior Center in Bellevue, WA. Discussion focused on reviewing the project's approach to pricing and managed lanes, HCT accommodation, transportation demand management, and definition of project alternatives. All input received will be provided to the Advisory and Executive Committees. Technical Committee members not present on June 4 are encouraged to provide specific feedback to the project team so that it can be included in the material provided to the other committees.

PRICING AND MANAGED LANES

Les Rubstello, WSDOT-Urban Corridors Office (UCO), and Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, brought the committee up to date on the pricing and managed lane analysis. Les explained that there are four managed lanes scenarios being studied. The project team has examined pricing scenarios just for SR-520 and there is additional analysis including the I-90 corridor. The SR-520 project has done tolling analysis. The I-405 project is also working on managed lane studies and the Urban Corridors Office has been regional examining mega project tolling and pricing options.

The following questions and comments were brought up:

- Ann Martin, King County, asked whether the project will test pricing on SR-520 and if they plan on testing other facilities. Jeff Peacock responded that the project is looking at pricing scenarios on SR-520 and I-90. Mike Grady, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), questioned pricing I-90 when it is already paid for. He asked if the intent of tolls is to pay for the facility expansion.
- King Cushman, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), discussed the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) conference on imagining the future and the value of congestion pricing. He said that there is public understanding on providing highway revenues and that roadways require future maintenance, like repairing a roof on the house. It takes more money to maintain the current facility and this is responsible management. Tolls manage demand, sustain the system, and provide upkeep for future generations. King noted that FHWA conference

summary material will be on the PSRC website and the Humphrey institute website, as well.

- Les Rubstello, WSDOT-UCO, explained that the gas tax is a user fee. This value pricing is a way to charge more money when the demand is high. People will pay more for a product that has more demand. Les mentioned that there are economic justice issues with tolling, where people who do not make enough money for a toll will have to use transit.

INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT METHODOLOGIES

Paul Krueger, WSDOT, brought the Technical Committee an update on the indirect and cumulative impact EIS methodologies. He explained that this project is looking at indirect effects in a manner never done before by WSDOT. Analysis will use PSRC models to examine how SR-520 corridor expansion will affect growth generally and in what direction. Paul stated that the indirect and cumulative impact methodology will be shared with the Technical Committee in a couple of weeks. This will be scheduled for discussion at the June 27 Technical Committee meeting.

At this point, discussion yielded the following points and questions:

- Ann Martin asked how the indirect and cumulative work will be incorporated to other regional studies and whether this work was just for the SR-520 project. Paul Krueger noted that this work will be applicable for a few projects.
- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, asked if there was a qualitative method in look at growth changes, assuming land use does not change. Paul noted the difficulties with making assumptions on how changes would occur in the next 15-20 years.
- Mike Grady asked for the environmental analysis date. Paul answered that the analysis uses the year 2030. Mike noted that assuming all of these plans reach fruition in 2030, he questioned what would happen if the growth comes out differently than planned. There is no guarantee that the growth will occur in Kirkland and the eastside. His concern is the use of the year 2030 and that this will result in an increased amount of impervious surface. There is a substantive difference between the years 2020 and 2030. Mike stated that NMFS will be doing an analysis of the project.
- Paul Carr, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA), suggested splitting alternative components according to pricing and to look at their indirect relationship with other components.

- Terry Swanson, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), asked for clarification on how the Trans-Lake Washington project indirect and cumulative impact analysis will be done differently from other projects.
- Terry Marpert, City of Redmond, requested clarification on the definition of an indirect impact. Paul explained that an indirect impact is something that occurs in time from the freeway expansion that is not directly related to construction

DEFINITION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues described community design workshop highlights. The workshops consisted of an overview presentation with breakout sessions.

Overall themes of the community design workshops were:

- Maintain pedestrian/bicycle path continuity and increase it beyond what the team had proposed.
- Look at the tradeoffs of relocating access, ramp locations, etc.
- Explore transportation demand management (TDM).
- Provide more detailed information on noise wall locations and height.
- Support the I-5/SR-520 and I-405/SR-520 interchange improvements regardless if rest of project is built.
- Request further discussion regarding property acquisition and mitigation.

Brad mentioned that there was concern on how the new SR-520 facility would specifically impact people's property and how this would affect real estate. Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, stated that the community design workshop summaries will be posted on the project website. She noted that there have been a series of University of Washington meetings and the project team plans on meeting with jurisdictions to discuss these issues. Workshops attendance has greatly increased and the workshops have provided many answers to public inquiries. Pat noted that the earlier workshops had around 30 participants, the Points community workshop had approximately 150 participants, and the Montlake community design workshop had around 70 attendees. The project plans on continuing this type of outreach.

- Len Newstrum asked if the height of the mid-lake high-rise issue brought out at the Points community design workshop had been addressed. He questioned whether it would save money to not have a larger high-rise and whether the project had explored requesting a high-rise waiver from the U.S. Coastguard.
- Krista Rave-Perkins, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), wanted to know if there will be community meetings with Bellevue. Pat Serie responded that the project team has not scheduled a meeting with Bellevue yet but they would be willing to meet with them.

SR-520 INTERCHANGE PLANS

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, went over current interchange work for the SR-520 project. He explained that the project team has worked with jurisdictions and the community on defining interchanges.

I-5 Interchange

Jeff stated that the I-5 interchange has not had any substantive changes since we last talked. The HOV lanes tie into I-5 express lanes southbound on the right side versus the left side. The project has plans that reverse the I-5 southbound off ramp (on the left side). Auxiliary lanes will drop at Mercer Street and Stewart Street. The left off-ramp for the 6-lane option has been shifted to the right side to ease traffic flow. There would be two homes impacted on the eastern corner.

Montlake Interchange

Jeff described that the project team has developed three interchange options for the Montlake area, two for the 6-lane alternative and one for the 8-lane alternative. The basic interchange layout remains unchanged. There is a braided ramp to the University District with a dedicated separation to ease access to Montlake Boulevard on the ramp structure. Earlier in the process, the project team had been directed to avoid expanding the Montlake Bridge to preserve its historical integrity. Recently Montlake community representatives have asked that the project team look at Montlake Bridge expansion options. The 6-lane option for Montlake Boulevard widens the Montlake Bridge on one side or both sides. Current engineering work consolidates and removes the ‘ramps to nowhere.’ The transit flyer stop has been moved to the middle of the facility.

Engineering work for the 8-lane alternative provides a second Montlake crossing and interchange in a tunnel under the Montlake Cut. The tunnel concept will have some impacts on the University of Washington parking lots and will require minimal ventilation. Several of the options show the traffic volumes dropping significantly on Montlake Boulevard. Additional widening of the SR-520 corridor would occur across Portage Bay. The project team has started stormwater facility design. Analysis will be geared to the year 2030. The SR-520 floating bridge plans will move the structure slightly north and provides a bicycle/pedestrian path connection in the direction of Madison Park. Lid lengths have been kept within 500 feet.

During the I-5 and Montlake interchange discussions, the following points and questions were brought up:

- Ann Martin requested that the project interchange drawings have more user-friendly labeling. Ann asked if the 4-lane alternative would provide ramps that solve the Mercer weave problem. Jeff Peacock responded that the Mercer weave

problem will not be addressed in the 4-lane alternative. The 4-lane alternative aims to just add safety and preservation improvements and the footprint of this alternative will be kept minimal. Ann asked where the bicycle/pedestrian lane would be located in the tunnel option.

- Mitch Wasserman asked if the Mercer weave solution will be carried forward for any of the alternatives. Mitch pointed out that this might be considered a safety improvement due to the hazards crossing the corridor. He asked that the project include the existing right of way on the handouts. Jeff Peacock responded that there will be Mercer weave improvements for the 6 and 8-lane alternatives. Mitch requested an explanation on the reasoning for a Montlake Cut tunnel versus an above-ground facility, and the relative costs.
- Peter Dewey, University of Washington, noted there are more 4-lane improvements that could be done. Peter clarified that there will be mix-and-match opportunities in the future. He requested that it be pointed out that the Montlake Bridge/Boulevard widening plans are to provide HOV lanes and he encouraged that the project make this clear to the Montlake community. He stated that the largest impact at the Montlake interchange is from the queuing to get onto the SR-520 eastbound. Peter asked if there are less environmental impacts for a tunnel than for bridge expansion.
- Emily Teachout, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, asked how the land under the ramps would address 4f regulations. Jennifer Bowman, Federal Transit Administration, requested that the 4f report address potential parkland additions. Emily pointed out that the tribes did not like the Montlake Bridge widening impacts due to fishing impacts. She noted that the project should look at lidding benefits to reducing noise levels at heights higher than 15 feet.
- Kurt Buchanan requested that the drawings illustrate the existing right of way.
- Paul Carr asked for a lidding update and for their purpose to be identified. He wondered what the options were for on top of lids. Jeff Peacock responded that lids provide community connectivity and opportunities for increased open space. Jeff stated that land use on top of lids has been narrowed to park facilities without public buildings or active ballpark type facilities. The I-5 lid has been extended south of SR-520 down to 10th Avenue. The Montlake lid has been placed west of Montlake Boulevard and 500 feet to the east of Montlake Boulevard.
- Mitch Wasserman requested information on how many feet the tunnel under the Montlake Cut would consume. Mitch asked why the tunnel to Pacific Street is not shown on any of the lid drawings. He would like more information on the assumptions.

- Terry Marpert asked about whether all four of the I-5 quadrant movements have been provided, with cost estimates. He asked if the project team has addressed this component with jurisdictions.

East of Lake Washington Interchange Plans

Jeff Peacock stated that the interchange plans for the area east of Lake Washington on SR-520 have not changed significantly since the Technical Committee last met. The project team is working with Bellevue and Kirkland to provide a smooth ramp to Bellevue Way and to accommodate all the traffic movements. There will be continued work on the Evergreen Point Road flyer stop and the project team plans on meeting with the Points communities' representatives to discuss the flyer stop further. The Executive Committee will decide whether the lids longer than 500 feet (requiring ventilation) should be studied further for noise mitigation purposes.

All the current movements at the I-405 interchange will be carried forward in project alternatives and the footprint is wider than it is today. At the 40th Street interchange there will be little improvement besides adding a flyer stop west of the interchange. For the 8-lane alternative, a ramp has been provided to the Redmond Town Center. There will be further analysis for providing HOV access to the SR 202 connection. The plans accommodate direct HOV access to/from Redmond, Seattle, and Bellevue.

Discussion yielded the following points and questions:

- Emily Teachout asked what the cul-de-sac aspect signifies. She asked about what project benefits are gained with the additional access to Redmond Town Center. She is concerned about a ramp crossing the Sammamish River and causing environmental impacts. She asked what the current access is like to Redmond Town Center. Terry Marpert mentioned his concern also. Emily asked if this ramp would provide development opportunities. Terry noted that some development opportunities would be provided, along with directing traffic away from downtown Redmond.
- Krista Rave-Perkins wanted to know if there are any project plans for expanding Northup Way and whether this will be addressed in the cumulative impact methodology report. Jeff Peacock answered that this will be addressed in the direct impact portion of the report and that the project team will be working on the local street impacts.
- Ann Martin noted that impacts on I-405 improvements will be addressed and pointed out that 148th Avenue NE interchange will not need any changes for this project.

- Jeff Brauns, CH2M Hill, pointed out that the existing freeway ends at Union Hill and not at SR 202. The project is looking at ending at SR 202 or beyond.
- Terry Marpert discussed that there should be a pedestrian crossing for those coming from the east, near 40th Street due to the long walking distance. Jeff Peacock said that this idea has not been shown on the drawing but that the project team is looking into that pedestrian access. Terry stated that he would like an HOV lane to be continued up Union Hill. Jeff stated that he would like to meet with Redmond to talk about this further.
- Len Newstrum asked if elevators at flyer stops would be provided to accommodate persons with disabilities. Jeff responded that the flyer stops will be fully ADA accessible.
- Mitch Wasserman suggested that the interchange costs be shared with the project committees.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

John Shadoff, WSDOT, presented updates on the transportation demand management (TDM) program, noting that many modifications were in response to Technical Committee input. John said that the project is looking into the idea of a TDM program oversight committee and ways to implement creative TDM ideas. He brought these issues to the PSRC Roundtable and they are coming up with solutions. The TDM program information will be discussed at the Advisory and Executive Committee meetings next week.

TDM program questions and points:

- Susan Sanchez, City of Seattle, mentioned her concerns about mode split information, reducing corridor trips, and transit service. She noted that there are incentives for transit service use but little funds for the transit service. Vanpools can sometimes have parking impacts.
- Krista Rave-Perkins said that the south Kirkland park and ride transit service (Metro) is horrendous. She said that I-90 has better service with 50 buses coming every hour. She questioned if the seven target areas are current (second paragraph of the major elements section). John Shadoff noted that this was done for the year 2020 so there may be some minor changes. Krista questioned whether the analysis should go north of the University District as not everyone goes around Lake Washington in that area.
- King Cushman noted the similar topics that came up in the I-405 project and that he is gaining experience on legislative response. He will work with the team with both local and regional level funding options. There are collective needs that can

be put into a legislative funding package. Aubrey Davis stated that the project could manage getting the TDM funded in a regional package independent of capital projects.

- Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue, stated that the \$250 million funding would go a long way towards funding urban planning that the King County Council has available. She suggested that the project look at getting some of this funding in this package.
- Mike Grady questioned whether the TDM growth effects will be addressed in the design or added to indirect methodologies. Les Rubstello, WSDOT-UCO, stated that this will be addressed in the transportation section. The project will study the effects of TDM and its indirect effects.

HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT ACCOMMODATION

Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit, presented summary-level information on project accommodation of high capacity transit. She noted that there will be more discussions on this topic. The project is looking at not precluding investments today for HCT in the future, as directed by the Executive Committee. The project team has analyzed different ways of looking at HCT for the future and technological possibilities which are difficult to predict.

Barbara explained the HCT options, including, adding no HCT accommodation, preserving HCT on SR-520 corridor, providing HCT accommodations on the SR-520 Bridge and its approaches, and HCT highway design. The project team is looking at building larger pontoons on the SR-520 Bridge for future HCT accommodation. Several of the options would require more right-of-way acquisition and would affect roadway design, especially in the areas with proposed lids. Cost would increase for purchasing right of way for bus rapid transit, although it would be less expensive to purchase right of way now than later. There will be additional cost and environmental impact analysis done. Barbara would like input in the next couple of weeks (e-mail comments to gillilandb@soundtransit.org). The HCT work will be brought before the Executive Committee and decisions for this will be scheduled for July.

Discussion yielded the following questions and points:

- Terry Marpert wondered where the I-90 light rail project plans on connecting to downtown Redmond. Barbara responded that Sound Transit does not know yet where the I-90 extension would connect to Redmond and she is unsure as to whether a connection will be provided to Bellevue Way. There will be a connection from Overlake to Redmond. Terry would like to investigate options with connecting to Redmond into the SR-520 corridor without going into

Bellevue. He would like a graphic and more information on Redmond connection options.

- Mike Grady asked if the project team had considered with the 8-lane buildout of providing two lanes for HCT. Barbara said that this would be unrealistic due to traffic displacement impacts.
- Len Newstrum suggested that the project look at HCT cost ranges for the future, HCT ranges of technology, and probable performance. He said that he has HCT diagrams that he would like to share with the team. He requested that the project look at high capacity transit examples in China and Virginia. Barbara noted that they have looked at technologies as a team. They have found that the monorail would take up less width but would be lid design issues.
- Les Rubstello stated that the SR-520 bridge design life is 75 years. Mitch noted that Barbara had said that HCT might be used in 50 years.
- King Cushman recommended connecting as many high capacity stops as possible. He suggested that the project commit to not converting HOV lanes to ensure public trust.

NEXT STEPS

The Advisory Committee will meet on June 10 and the Executive Committee will meet on June 12. There will be another Technical and Advisory joint committee meeting on Thursday, June 27, at the University of Washington Horticulture Center, Seattle. This meeting will cover indirect and cumulative effects sections in the EIS impact methodology report and provide input to the Executive Committee on recommending a Trans-Lake Washington preliminary preferred alternative. The project team will be providing information on identifying a preliminary preferred alternative and will be working on refining project alternatives.

The remaining questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Peter Dewey requested more information on roadway pricing (written description). Jeff Peacock noted that more pricing information will be available in the next couple of weeks, by the June 27 Technical Committee meeting.
- Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, stated that there was an agency concurrence meeting last month and that the alternative components will need to be sorted out. The final design is planned to be ready by September.
- Mike Grady recommended that the HCT information be tied in with illustrations to explain the material better. He also would like all the HCT effects in one package and the mathematics that drive the demand management strategies. Barbara said the Executive Committee will have to confirm HCT work this July.
- Susan Sanchez, City of Seattle, stated that Ethan Melone will be representing the City of Seattle.

ACTION ITEMS

- Share the indirect and cumulative impact methodology at the June 27 Technical Committee meeting.
- Provide more illustrations tying in with HCT information, HCT effects in one package and the mathematics that drive the demand management strategies.
- Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit, would like input in the next couple of weeks (e-mail comments to gillilandb@soundtransit.org) on the HCT work.
- Peter Dewey requested more, current information on roadway pricing (written description) for the June 27 Technical Committee meeting. He would like the project team to provide a total project cost (high-level).
- Meet with Redmond to discuss HCT connections to Redmond, HOV lane access to Union Hill, and pedestrian crossings at the proposed flyer stop.
- Provide interchange cost information for the project committees. Provide final list of interchanges that the Executive Committee will be voting on.
- Examine TDM opportunities on reducing traffic.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Community Design Workshop Themes
- Updated Project Information for Counties Planning the Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID)- CEVP
- Summary of TDM Program for the Trans-Lake Washington Project
- SR-520 Corridor: Montlake to Bellevue Way High Capacity Transit Accommodation Scenarios
- Final List of Pricing/Managed Lanes Scenarios Being Evaluated for SR-520 (5/13/02)
- Project Interchange and lid drawings

MEETING ATTENDEES

Technical Committee Members

Present	Name		ORGANIZATION
X	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Brooks	Allyson	Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
X	Buchanan	Kurt	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
X	Cushman	King	Puget Sound Regional Council (Peter Beaulieu)
X	Dewey	Peter	University of Washington
	Godfrey	Dave	City of Kirkland
X	Grady	Mike	National Marine Fisheries Service
X	Kennedy	Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	Kennedy	Steve	Sound Transit
	Kenny	Ann	Washington Department of Ecology
X	Kircher	Dave	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (Paul Carr)
	Leonard	Jim	Federal Highway Administration
X	Marpert	Terry	City of Redmond
X	Martin	Ann	King County Department of Transportation
X	Newstrum	Len	Town of Yarrow Point
X	Rave-Perkins	Krista	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
	Pratt	Austin	U.S. Coast Guard, 13 th District
X	Sanchez	Susan	City of Seattle (Ethan Melone)
X	Schulze	Doug	City of Medina
X	Sparrman	Goran	City of Bellevue (Kim Beckland)
	Sullivan	Maureen	WSDOT – NW Region
X	Swanson	Terry	Washington Department of Ecology
X	Teachout	Emily	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
X	Wasserman	Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
	Willis	Joe	Town of Hunts Point

Other attendees

Jonathan Dubman, Montlake Community Council
Kevin Shively, Transportation Choices Coalition
Kitty Nelson, NMFS
Aubrey Davis, Washington State Transportation Commission

Project Team

Les Rubstello, WSDOT
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
Jane Farquharson, PSTC
John Shadoff, WSDOT
Jean Mabry, WSDOT
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
Jennifer Cannon, EnviroIssues

JJC